

Bread or Bombs ?

(India's Life Threatening Defence Expenditure)



By Jasvir Singh



Foundation for Educational Innovations in Asia - FEDINA
AUGUST 2009

12092
CPHE - CL

SOCHARA

Community Health

Library and Information Centre (CLIC)

Centre for Public Health and Equity

No. 27, 1st Floor, 6th Cross, 1st Main,
1st Block, Koramangala, Bengaluru - 34

Tel : 080 - 41280009

email : clic@sochara.org / cphe@sochara.org

www.sochara.org

Bread or Bombs?

(India's life threatening defence expenditure)

By Jasvir Singh

**Foundation for educational innovations in Asia –FEDINA
(August 2009)**

Bread or Bombs?

(India's the threatening defense expenditure)

By J. S. G. S. S.

GC-100

12092 pag

Democracy, Deprivation and the Defence expenditure in India

By Jasvir Singh

Introduction: Around six decades ago, we the people of India constituted India into a 'SOVEREIGN SOCIALIST SECULAR DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC' to secure to all its citizens, 'Justice, social, economic and political...Equality of status and opportunity; and to promote among them all; Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual...' The most important goals, the republic of India set before itself, are enshrined in the Preamble of the Constitution of India where it has promised to secure to all citizens; social, economic and political justice, equality of status and opportunity and the right to live with dignity. The way to achieve these objectives is shown in part III & IV (the Fundamental Right and Directive Principles of State Policy chapters) of the Constitution. The Preamble, Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of State Policy in our Constitution are statements of certain aspirations whose fulfillment was regarded as essential to the kind of society which the constitution makers wanted to build.

Democracy what and why? Democracy is said to be the best political system of governance in the modern world. Aristotle, more than two thousand years ago, had propounded the idea that social or political system be judged by the extent to which it promotes 'human good'. He distinguished a good political system from a bad one by its successes or failure in enabling people to lead 'flourishing lives'. In other words, a good political system is that which promotes the well-being and happiness of the people. In this way one important measure of comparing the performance of different political systems is the success or failure of the governments (State) in supporting happy, long and productive lives for their citizens within the environmental means.

Democracy is defined as a political system of governance where more than one party take part in regularly held free and fair elections based on universal, equal and secret suffrage and competes for power to run the state of affair of the nation. According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union's Universal Declaration on Democracy adopted in 1997:

...Democracy aims to protect and promote the dignity and fundamental rights of the individuals, instill social justice and foster economic and social development. Democracy is a political system that enables people to freely choose an effective, honest, transparent and accountable government.... Genuine democracy presupposes a genuine partnership between men and women in conducting the affairs of society. Democracy is also inseparable from human rights and founded on the primacy of the law, for which judicial institutions and independent, impartial, effective oversight mechanisms are the guarantors. (Democratic)... society must be committed to meeting the basics needs of the most disadvantaged groups to ensure their participation in the working of the democracy...."

According to the HDR 2002, "...democracy also requires functioning institutions. It requires a legislature that represents the people, not one controlled by the president, prime minister, bureaucrats or the military. It requires an independent judiciary that enforces the rule of law with equal concern for all people. It requires well-functioning political parties and electoral system.... It requires an accessible media that is free, independent and unbiased, not controlled by the State or by corporate interests. These institutions underpinned by democratic values and respect for human rights, provide checks and balances against the risks of tyranny and of populism, because in democracies populist politicians can mobilized support by using propaganda and appeals to racism and other forms of intolerance(page 54,55).... Democratic institutions and process can also contribute to human development...." Because of all these features it is claimed that democracy is more suitable to promote human dignity.

In short we can say that democracy is a political system of governance which facilitates/promotes the right of the citizens to live with human dignity and protect them from social, economic or political injustices. This also means that all those things which are must for dignified human existence, must also form the basic ingredients of democracy. Human dignity is the sum of social dignity, economic dignity and political dignity and all these are of equal importance. Human dignity cannot be achieved in the absence / at the cost of any of the above three. If a citizen or a group of citizens are suffering from any of the above indignities it cannot be said that that citizen or that group of citizens is living with human dignity. The means to promote human dignity is to promote socio, economic and political justice. In other words social, economic and political injustices are the antithesis of human dignity and of democracy. India is one among the 89 democracies in the world. It is also the largest democracy (in terms of population) in the world as nearly 38% of the population of all democratic countries resides in India. When we are comparing India with other countries we should also keep in mind its status of being the largest democracy in the world.

Constitutional imperatives and the State in India: India is a Constitutional democracy and the State in India is the creation of the Constitution of India. The State, therefore, exists to fulfill, protect and promote the constitutional promises, objectives and goals. The Preamble, Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of State Policy are also called the Constitutional Manifesto. In the exercise of power the State has to follow the constitutional manifesto and the failure or success of the governments can be judged mainly on the basis of the fulfillment/non-fulfillment of the constitutional manifesto. Although the stated aims of India's constitutional democracy is to, 'constitute India into a Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic and to secure to all its citizens Justice social, economic and political ... Equality of status and opportunity...and to assure dignity of the individual but after nearly six decades of the existing of the democratic State and the Constitution, these stated ends are still a distant dreams for hundreds of

millions of Indians who are living in extreme poverty and deprivation. According to the Supreme Court of India:

“The objective of the people in establishing the Constitution was to promote justice, social and economic and liberty and equality. The modus operandi to achieve these objectives is set out in Part III and IV of the constitution. Each of these parts represents in the main the statements in one sense of certain aspirations whose fulfillment was regarded as essential to the kind of society which the Constitution-makers wanted to build...The task of protecting and realizing these rights is imposed upon all the organs of the State, namely legislature, executive and judicial.” (Unni Krishnan, JP v State of AP, AIR 1993, 2229 SC)

Below we are highlighting those provisions of the Constitution which aims at achieving socio-economic justice and improving the living and working condition of the Indian citizens:

- No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. **Art. 21**
- Traffic in human beings and *begar* and other similar forms of forced labour are prohibited and any contravention of this provision shall be an offence punishable in accordance with law. **Art. 23**
- That the State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social economic and political, shall inform all the institutions of the national life; **Art. 38**
- The State shall, in particular, strive to minimize the inequalities in income and endeavour to eliminate inequalities in status, facilities and opportunities, not only among individuals but also amongst groups of people residing in different areas or engaged in different vocations; **Art. 38(2)**
- The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing – (**Art. 39**)
- that the citizens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood; (**Art. 39 a**)
- that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to sub serve the common good; (**Art. 39b**)
- that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment; (**Art. 39c**)

- The State shall, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education and to public assistance in case of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement and in other cases of undeserved want. (**Art. 41**)
- The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organization or in any other way, to all workers agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life. (**Art. 43**)
- The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years. (**Art. 45**)
- The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation. (**Art. 46**)
- The State shall regard the raising of the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health as among its primary duties... (**Art. 47**)

Supreme Court on Directive Principles of State Policy and the Right to Life:

Let us see the views of the Supreme Court of India (which only has the power to interpret the Constitution of India) on the directive principles of state policy (Chapter IV of the Constitution of India) and the right to life as guaranteed under article 21 of the constitution:

Supreme Court on the Directive Principles:

- Incorporation of Directive Principles of State Policy casting the high duty upon the State to strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may, a social order in which justice – social, economic and political – shall inform all the institutions of the national life, is not idle point but command to action. We can never forget, except at our peril that the Constitution obligates the State to ensure an adequate means of livelihood to its citizens and to see that the health and strength of workers, men and women, are not abused, that exploitation moral and material, shall be extradited".
(Fatehchand Himmatlal v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1977 SC 1825 at page 1833)
- The Directive Principles of State Policy and the Fundamental Rights are the conscience of the Constitution and the purpose of the Directive Principles is to set certain socio-economic goals for immediate attainment

by bringing about a non-violent social revolution... (Pathuma v. State of Kerala (1978)2 SCR 537)

- May I say that the Directive Principles of State Policy should not be permitted to become a mere rope of sand. If the State fails to create conditions in which the fundamental freedoms can be enjoyed by all, the freedom of the few will be at the mercy of the many and then all freedom will vanish..." (Justice V.V. Chandrachud in Keshavananda Bharti v. State of Kerala as Reported in Unni Krishnan v. State of AP)
- Political democracy without social and economic democracy would always remain unstable... economic democracy aids consolidation of social stability and smoothen working of political democracy..." (Kirloskar Bros. v. ESI (1996)2 SCC page 687)

Supreme Court on the right to life:

- The sweep of the right to life conferred by article 21 is wide and far reaching. It does not mean merely that life cannot be extinguished or taken away as, for example by the imposition and execution of the death sentence, except according to the procedure established by law. That is but one aspect of the right to life. An equally important facet of that right is the right to livelihood because no person can live without the means of livelihood... (Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation 1985 AIR 1986 SC page 193 &194)
- As every one has to eat to live and they can eat only if they work or have means of livelihood and get paid adequately. It is the work or the means of livelihood only, which sustains and enables a person and his family to live...The principles contained in Arts 39(a) and 41 must be regarded as equally fundamental in the understanding and interpretation of the meaning and content of fundamental rights. If there is an obligation upon the State to secure to the citizens an adequate means of livelihood and the right to work, it would be sheer pedantry to exclude the right to livelihood from the content of the right to life..." (Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation 1985 AIR 1986 SC Para 33)
- The expression 'life' assured in Article 21 does not connote animal existence or continued drudgery through life. It has a much wider meaning which includes right to livelihood, better standard of living..." (Kirloskar Bros. v. ESI (1996)2 SCC)
- We think the right to life includes right to live with human dignity and all that goes with it viz., bare necessities of life such as adequate nutrition, clothing, and shelter..." (Francis Mullin v. Administrator of Union Territory of Delhi 1982(2) SCR 516; AIR 1981 SC 746)

- Basic needs of the man have traditionally been accepted to be three – food, clothing and shelter. The right to life is guaranteed in any civilized society. That would take within its sweep the right to food, right to clothing, the right to decent environment and reasonable accommodation to live in. The difference between the need of an animal and the human being for shelter has to be kept in view. For an animal it is the bare protection of body; for a human being it has to be suitable accommodation which would allow him to grow in every aspect physical, mental and intellectual ...” (Shanti Star Builder v. Narayan Khimalal (1990) 1 SCC 520; AIR 1990, SC 630)
- Right to live guaranteed in any civilized society implies the right to food, water, decent environment, education, medical care and shelter. These are the basic human rights known to any civilized society. All civil, political, social and cultural rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Convention or under the Constitution of India cannot be exercised without these basic human rights...” (Chameli Singh & others v. State of U.P; JT 1995 (9) SC 380)
- People bowed under the weight of poverty are unlikely to stand up for their Constitutional rights. Welfare State exists not only to enable the people to eke out their livelihood but also to make it possible for them to lead a good life. State strives to provide facilities and opportunities to them to improve excellence...to enable them to lead a good life assuring dignity of person under legal order. Equality of opportunity is not simply a matter of legal equality. Its existence depends not merely on the absence of disabilities but on the presence of abilities...” (As reported in AIR 1996 SC 1051)
- Many a day have come and gone after 26.1.1950 but no leaf is turned in the lives of the poor and the gap between the rich and the poor is gradually widening on the brink of being unbridgeable...” (Charan Singh v. State of Punjab as reported in Supreme Today, of 1.1.1997 page 25)

From the above we can see that the Constitution of India has unambiguously stated the basic purpose of the creation of Indian Republic. It is the constitutional and legal binding on the State to make proper use of all the available resources for achieving these constitutional ends by providing facilities and opportunities for a decent standard of living to all citizens within the limits of India's economic capacity and development.

Part II

State of India's citizens: In the first part we have seen the importance of socio-economic justice and the right of all Indian citizens to live with dignity as enshrined in the our constitution. In this section, let us see what is the state of India's citizens (or what are the socio-economic realities of India) after around six decades of the working of the Constitution of India.

Poverty, hunger, ill-health and illiteracy were some of the most serious and pressing problems which the people of India were facing at the beginning of the 20th century when India was under the British rule. Dadabhai Naoroji in his presidential address to the Indian National Congress held at Calcutta in 1906 had said that the problem of mass poverty in India was the result of foreign rule and to eradicate poverty it was necessary to, "...achieve self-government so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine and plague and scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence may be saved..." On achieving freedom from British rule, Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister of free India, who remained at the helm of affairs in the country for seventeen years, spelt out his major task while assuming power on August 15, 1947, "...to bring freedom and opportunity to common man, to the peasants and workers of India. To fight and end poverty and ignorance and disease..." But there were more poor, illiterates and disease stricken Indians in 1961 than in August, 1947 when he first became the prime minister of India.

Below we are giving some examples from the official data/statement (government of India or its agencies/officials or the UN and its agencies) which tells us about the plight of the Indian citizens after around six decades of the existence of the Constitution of India.

1. According to the Economic Survey - 1996-97 (published by the Union government, "...Fifty years after achieving independence, poverty, illiteracy, disease and lack of minimum social services continue to afflict hundreds of millions of our people..."
2. The then President of India Sh. KR Narayanan while addressing the nation on the eve of Republic Day in the year 2000 had said, "Fifty years into our life in the Republic, we find that Justice- socio, economic and political – remains an unrealized dream for millions of our fellow citizens. The benefits of our economic growth are yet to reach them. We have world's largest reservoirs of technical personnel, but also the world's largest number of illiterates, world's largest middle class, but also the largest number of people below the poverty line and the largest number of children suffering from malnutrition..."
3. According to the government of India's estimates there were around 302 million people in India in year 2004-05 who were living below the official

poverty line. (221 million rural poor living on less than Rs. 12 per day or Rs. 356 per month and around 81 million urban poor living on less than Rs. 18 per day or Rs. 539 per month.) The following two tables give the number and percentage of officially poor people in India and the official poverty line from 1973 -74 to 2004-05. In more than 30 years the number of poor has come down from 321 millions in 1973-74 to 301.7 millions in 2004-05 or less than 20 million people in India have escaped poverty. In contrast according to the World Bank's estimates, the number of poor in China has come down by around 400 millions in 20 years!

Table -1 Number and % of poor in India for the last three decades

Year	Rural poor	Urban poor	Total poor
1973-74	261 mn. (56.4%)	60 MN. (49.0%)	321 MN. (54.9%)
1977-78	264 mn. (53.1%)	65 mn. (45.2%)	329 mn. (51.3%)
1983	252 mn. (45.7%)	71 mn. (40.8%)	323 mn. (44.5%)
1987-88	232 mn. (39.1%)	75 mn. (38.2%)	307 mn. (38.9%)
1993-94	244 mn. (37.3%)	76 mn. (32.4%)	320 mn. (36.0%)
2004- 05	220.9 mn. (28.3%)	80.8mn. (25.7%)	301.7mn. (27.5%)

Table - 2 The line of poverty in India

Year	Rural poor	Urban poor
1973-74	Rs. 1.60 per day per person	Rs. 1.89 per day per person
1977-78	Rs. 2.02 per day per person	Rs. 2.32 per day per person
1983	Rs. 3.39 per day per person	Rs. 3.92 per day per person
1987-88	Rs. 4.39 per day per person	Rs. 5.07 per day per person
1993-94	Rs. 7.63 per day per person	Rs. 8.84 per day per person
2004- 05	Rs. 11.88 per day per person	Rs. 17.95 per day per person

(Source: For both tables; Poverty line and level up to 1993-94, Economic Survey - 2001-02, GOI. For 2004-05, Press Information Bureau, GOI , press release of March 2007)

4. According to the National Commission on Employment in the Unorganised Sector (NCEUS) report, published by the government of India, there were 836 million Indian citizens who were living on less than Rs. 20 per day and 444 million of them were living on less than Rs. 15 per day.
5. To put this amount (Rs. 15 and Rs. 20 per day) in perspective, the price of cheapest variety of rice in Karnataka in the grocery shops for the past one year is Rs. 28 per kg. This means a person can purchase only around 500 gm of rice per day with Rs. 15 as PDS is available only to the

people living below the official poverty line (Rural areas below Rs. 12 and urban areas below Rs. 18 per person per day). It may be noted here that the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) has recommended the following food items (and the required quantity) for an adult to keep the body fit and working for a labourer's family:

Table -3 Food Requirements for adult male of labourer's family

	Quantity	Cost in November 2009
1. Cereals (rice)	670 gms	18.75 (Rs. 28 per Kg.)
2. Pulses	60 gms	4.80 (Rs. 80 per Kg)
3. Green vegetable, roots & tubers etc	200 gms	3.00 (Rs. 15 per Kg)
4. Oil/fat	65 gms	3.90 (Rs. 60 per Kg.)
5. Sugar	55 gms	1.90 (Rs. 35 per Kg)
6. Milk	250 gms	4.00 (Rs. 16 per ltr.)
Total cost as on November 29, 2009		Rs. 36.35 per day per adult

We can see from this table that to purchase the recommended food items by the ICMR for an adult male of a labourer's family in India need at least Rs. 36.35 per day and it does not include cooking fuel and other necessary ingredients for cooking. It may be noted that in India all those persons spending Rs. 18 or above per day (in urban areas) are considered above the poverty line and are not eligible for PDS ration. This also means that all those Indians who were living on less than Rs 36 per day in November 2009 were unable to consume the quantity of food recommended by the ICMR.

6. According to the latest poverty estimates of the World Bank, there were around 1374 million poor in the world (living on less than \$1.25 per day) and 456 million of them were in India. This means that India was home to around 33% of world's poor. India was also one among the 34 countries in the world where proportion of people living below the poverty line (of \$1.25 pppd) was above 40%
7. Similarly according to Global Hunger Index -2008, around 200 million Indians are hungry out of a total of around 962 million hungry in the world and India is home to the world's largest hungry population. The condition of hunger in India was termed as alarming by the Global Hunger Index - 2008. It may be noted here that according to the GHI -2008, India was among the 23 hungriest countries in the world.
8. On the health front, India was one of the worst 50 countries in the world (out of 197 countries) where under 5 year mortality rate was the highest. It may be noted here that Nepal and Bangladesh were not in the list of these infamous 50 countries having highest under 5 year mortality rate.

India was also one among the worst 50 countries in the world where MMR was 450 or above. Percentage of infants with low birth weight was one of the highest in India (28%), the same in the developing countries was 15%, in the least developed countries it was 17%, in Sub-Saharan Africa it was 15% and in the world it was 14%. In Tanzania it was 10% where as the PCGNI in Tanzania was less than half than that of India's PCGNI.

9. On the education front India's performance is one of the worst in the world. India was one of the 27 countries in the world where adult literacy rate was below 65%. In case of youth literacy rate India was one among those 29 countries in the world where youth literacy was below 80%. In fact India's adult literacy rate, according to the HDR - 2006, was lower than the adult literacy rate of low income countries, Sub-Saharan Africa, Least developed countries and Developing countries. Even the adult literacy rate of Tanzania (United Republic of) was much higher than the India's adult literacy rate, although the per capita income of Tanzania at PPP was much lower than India's PCGDP at PPP.
10. There were 58 countries in the world whose PCGDP at PPP was below the PCGDP of India according to HDR -2006. In 22 of these world's poorest countries, the percentage of people living BPL (of \$1.25 pppd at PPP) was less than that of in India. In 30 of these poorest countries GHI was lower than that of in India, meaning that hunger situation in India was worse than these 30 poorest countries. In 17 of these poorest countries under 5 year mortality rate was lower than India's under 5 year mortality rates. In 15 of these poorest countries of the world Infant mortality rate (IMR) was lower than India's IMR. In 15 of these countries maternal morality rate was lower than the MMR in India. Adult literacy rate in more than one third of these poorest countries was higher than that of India's adult literacy rate. In other words although economically 57 countries in the world were poorer than India (in terms of PCGDP at PPP as per the HDR -2006) but the performance of many of these poor countries was much better in health, education and poverty indicators when compared to India's performance in health, education and poverty indicators.

Now let us discuss in some detail about health and educational deprivation faced by the people of India and the effects of these deprivations on their lives.

Health deprivations in India: 'Health', according to the World Health Organisation (WHO), is a state of complete physical, mental and social well being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity'. Some of the most important causes of ill health in India are; unsafe drinking water and lack of sanitation, undernourishment, poor and unhygienic living and working conditions and lack of access to good health care. It may be appropriate here to underline the constitutional directive to the State on health and nutrition of the citizens:

“... The State shall regard the raising of the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health as among its primary duties...” (Art 47)

The above is one of the Directive Principles of State Policy of the Constitution of India. It is the constitutional duty of the State in India to apply these directive principles while making laws and in the governance of the country. As can be seen from the above constitutional directive to the State, the State in India was supposed to regard the raising of the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health as among its primary duties. But in the past six decades, the improvement of public health and raising the level of nutrition is not being considered by the State (especially the union government) as among its primary duties, if we see the government spending on health and nutrition. The result of not following/fulfilling this directive is that today, India is among one of the very few countries in the world where morbidity and mortality levels (due to health deprivations) are very high. The deprivation of health in Indian is so severe and serious that lakhs of Indian citizens die every years due to easily preventable and curable causes of diseases and ill health. These lakhs of Indian citizens die every year mainly because this great country could not provide them adequate and nutritious food, adequate quantity of safe water and sanitation and affordable basic health services. These are the things which even poor countries can also provide to all its citizens. According to the World Health Organization (WHO):

‘...almost 95 per cent of all the useful remedies that science and human experience has discovered, whether in curing or prevention, can be provided at a cost that even the poorest countries can afford for their entire population, through provision of primary health care. The primary health care included at its minimum, health education, promotion of food supply and proper nutrition, an adequate supply of safe water and basic sanitation, maternal and child health care, immunization against major infectious diseases, prevention and control of locally endemic diseases, appropriate treatment of common diseases and provision of essential drugs.’

Nature and extent of health deprivation in India: The seriousness of health deprivation can be seen from the following facts;

- According to Global Hunger Index (GHI) -2008, around 200 million Indians are hungry out of a total of around 962 million hungry in the world and India is home to the world's largest hungry population. The condition of hunger in India was termed as alarming by the Global Hunger Index -2008. It may be noted here that according to the GHI -2008, India was among the 25 hungriest countries in the world (at number 23) and Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bhutan and Maldives from South Asia were not in this infamous list of 25 hungriest countries in the world. Among 89 democratic countries of the

world, India and Mali were the only two democratic countries in this in famous list of world's 25 hungriest countries.

- The percentage of infants born with low birth weight in India is one of the highest in the world according to the State of the World's Children (SWC) - 2009 brought out by UNICEF. Globally, the percentage of infants with low birth weight was 14% and in India it was 28 %. It may be noted here that the despite the fact that India's per capita GNI was \$950 in 2007 and the per capita GNI of Uganda (\$340) and the per capita GNI of United Republic of Tanzania (\$400), but still the percentage of infants born with low weight were 14% in Uganda, 10% in United Republic of Tanzania and 28% in India. The other important fact in this context is that nearly 40% of the world's low birth babies were born in India in year 2007. The total low birth babies born in the world in year 2007 were around 1.90 crores and the total low birth babies born in India in that year were around 76 lakhs.
- Nearly 19,53,000 children below the age of 5 year died in India in year 2007 according to the State of the World's Children (SWC) -2009. There was no other country in the world where this large number of under 5 years children had died in 2007.
- Tuberculosis (TB) remains a serious public health problem claiming about 4,17,000 deaths every year. TB is also a cause of suffering for the millions who become victims of fresh cases of TB every year. (ES 2004-05 page 235)
- Diarrhoea claims some 4,50,000 lives annually in India more than in any country (HDR-2006 page 63)
- Approximately 4,00,000 deaths occur annually due to cancer in India. It is estimated that there are nearly 20 to 25 lakh cancer cases at any given point of time and around 7 to 9 lakh new cases of cancer occur every year in India. (ES 2005-06 page 214)
- Around 1,20,000 pregnant women died in year 2007 due to child birth related problems, mainly because of easily preventable causes and especially because the percentage of birth attended by the skilled health personnel in India is one of the lowest in the world.

The following table shows the health deprivation in India, low middle income countries (LMIC) and the world.

Table -4

Health crisis in India

		India	World	LMIC
1	Percentage of children under 5 year who are mal-nourished	43.5%	23.9%	25.2%
2	Under 5 year mortality rate	76	72	54
3	Percentage of Birth attended by skilled personal	47%	65%	69%
4	Percentage of infants with low birth weight (Last column LIC not LMIC)	30%	15%	16% (for LIC)
5	Infant mortality rate (IMR)	57	49	54 (for LIC)
6	Neo-natal mortality rate	43	30	33 (for LIC)
7	Maternal mortality rate	450	400	450 (for LIC)

(Source: World Development Report -2009 for serial number 1, 2, and 3, for serial number 4, 5, 6 and 7 State of the World's Children 2009)

According to the National Health Policy of India (NHPI) -2002, "...The existing public health infrastructure is far from satisfactory. For the outdoor medical facilities in existence, funding is generally insufficient, the presence of medical and Para-medical personnel is often much less than that required by the prescribed norms, the availability of consumables is frequently negligible; the equipments in many public hospitals is often obsolescent and unusable; and, the buildings are in dilapidated state. In the indoor treatment facilities again, the equipment is often obsolescent; the availability of essential drugs is minimal; the capacity of the facilities is grossly inadequate, which leads to over-crowding and consequentially to a steep deterioration in the quality of services...the morbidity and mortality levels in the country are still unacceptably high

These unsatisfactory health indices are, in turn, an indication of the limited success of the public health system in meeting the preventive and curative requirements of the general public."

According to 'An Approach to the 11th Five Year Plan' published by the Planning Commission, Government of India, "...there continue to be large gaps in availability of even the most basic services such as maternal and child care, clean drinking water and access to basic sanitation facilities. The poor especially, do not even have minimum access...Rural health care in most States is marked by absenteeism of doctors/health providers, low levels of skills, shortage of medicines..."

This is the 'official' picture of the state of health of the nation and we can very well imagine the real story of the state of health of the citizens of our nation. If health crisis is so serious and severe in India, why it is being allowed to continue so long? Do we lack economic capacity to handle this crisis? Now let us see what is the

public spending on health in India as percentage of India's GDP and also as percentage of total public expenditure in India.

Table - 5 **Total government spending on Health - 2008-09 (B.E.)**

	Central Government	All State Governments	Central & all State govts.
Total government expenditure	Rs. 7,50,884 cr.	Rs. 7,34,652 cr	Rs.14,85,536 cr
Expenditure on Health & FW	Rs. 18,123 cr	Rs. 56,932 cr	Rs.75,055 cr
Health as % of total spending	2.41%	7.75%	5.0%
Per capita per day health expenditure	43 paisa	Rs. 1.35	Rs. 1.78

In year 2008-09, the total allocation for health (centre and all state governments) in India was Rs. 75,055 cr. which was only 1.4% of the GDP (ES 2008-09) in that year. The total allocation for Union Ministry of Health & Family Welfare for the current year (2009-10) is Rs. 22,641 cr. which is 0.38% (less than 0.4%) of India's GDP. The expenditure on Union Ministry of Health and FW was only around 2% of the total expenditure of the Central government in 2009-10. From the above table we can see that the total allocation for union ministry of Health and Family Welfare for year 2008-09 was only Rs. 18,123 and it would be less than paisa 45 per person per day. But even 43 paisa per day is not being spent on the needy people as most of the expenditure of the Union Health and Family Welfare Ministry is being spent on salaries and up-keep (maintenance) of the Ministry. The ministry of Health and FW had spent crores of rupees on advertisements to give publicity to certain individuals in February 2008, but for the common citizens it may not have spent even paise 35 per person per day.

Although the deprivation in health in India is one of the highest in the world, public spending on health is one of the lowest in the world. The following two tables show the government expenditure on health as % of total government expenditure in India, World and in Low Middle Income Countries (LMIC) and also of 5 South Asian countries.

In the following table we are showing India's share in world's total deaths on account of maternal mortality rate (MMR) and under 5 year deaths and government expenditure on health.

Table - 6 India's share in world's death and government health spending

	World	India	India's share in the world
Total under 5 year deaths in year 2007	92,16,000	19,53,000	21.2%
MMR	5,43,800	1,22,035	22.5%
Total government expenditure on health	\$2836 bn.	\$ 8 bn.	0.28%
Total government expenditure on defence	\$1120 bn.	\$22.3 bn.	2%

Table - 7 Government spending on Health in India, world and LMIC

		India	World	LMIC
1	Government expenditure on health as % of total govt. exp.	3.4%	14.3%	8.2%
2	Government expenditure on health as % of total health exp.	25%	57.6%	43.2%
3	Per capita government expenditure on health	\$7	\$429	\$33
4	Out of pocket expenditure as% of private exp. on health	91.4%	49.3%	85.7%

(Source: World Health Statistics -2009 by WHO)

Table -8 Health indicators and government spending on health in South Asia

	Under 5 Year deaths	Infants with low birth weight	Government spending on health as% of total government spending
India	72	26%	3.4%
B'desh	61	22%	7.0%
Nepal	55	21%	9.2%
Sri Lanka	21	22%	8.3%
Maldives	30	22%	9.2%
World	68	14%	14.3%
LMIC			8.2%

(Source: WHS -2009 & SWC-2009)

According to the World Health Statistics-2009 published by the World Health Organisation, there were only three countries out of 193 countries whose government expenditure on health as percentage of total government expenditure

was lower than India (Burundi, Myanmar and Pakistan), in case of Iraq it was same as in India, and Somalia has not reported government expenditure on health as percentage of total government expenditure. This means in 188 countries out of 193 countries the government expenditure on health as percentage of total government expenditure was higher than that of India's, in one country (Iraq) it was same as in India, in only three countries it was less than that of India's. It may be noted here that all the three countries where the government expenditure on health as percentage of total government expenditure was lower than that of India's were non-democracy. This means all the 89 governments of democratic countries and 99 governments of non-democratic countries were spending more on health as percentage of their total expenditure than the democratic and pro poor and pro-ordinary people's government in India.

Below we are giving the health indicators of 5 largest populated countries, 5 largest democratic countries and 5 largest economies (countries with largest GDP in the world in terms of PPP) in the world. India is one among all these three group of countries.

Table -9 Health Indicators of 5 largest populated countries

	China	India	USA	Indonesia	Brazil
1. Total Population (in Million)	1320	1123	302	226	192
2. PCGNI at PPP	\$5370	\$2740	\$45850	\$3580	\$9370
3. Population BPL (\$1.25 pppd)	15.9%	41.6%	--	21.4%	7.8%
4. Infant with low birth weight	2%	28%	8%	9%	8%
5. Life expectancy at birth	73 yr	64 yr	78 yr	70 yr	72 yr
6. MMR	45	450	11	420	110
7. IMR	19	54	7	25	20
8. Under 5 year mortality rate	22	72	8	31	22
9. Total number of under 5 year deaths	3,82,000	19,53,000	34,000	1,36,000	82,000
10. Government expenditure on health as % of total government expenditure	9.9%	3.4%	19.3%	6.2%	7.2%
11. Per capita government expenditure on health (at average exchange rate)	\$38	\$7	\$3076	\$20	\$204

(Source: S. No. 1- 3, WDR -2009; 5 to 9, SWC -2009 and S. No. 10 &11 World Health Statistics 2009 published by WHO)

Table -10

Health Indicators of 5 largest democracies in the world

	India	USA	Indonesia	Brazil	Japan
1. Total Population (in Million)	1123	302	226	192	128
2. PCGNI at PPP	\$2740	\$45850	\$3580	\$9370	34,600
3. Population BPL (\$1.25 pppd)	41.6%	--	21.4%	7.8%	--
4. Infant with low birth weight	28%	8%	9%	8%	8%
5. Life expectancy at birth	64 yr	78 yr	70 yr	72 yr	83 yr
6. MMR	450	11	420	110	6
7. IMR	54	7	25	20	3
8. Under 5 year mortality rate	72	8	31	22	4
9. Total number of under 5 year deaths	19,53,000	34,000	1,36,000	82,000	4000
10. Government expenditure on health as % of total government expenditure	3.4%	19.3%	6.2%	7.2%	17.9%
11. Per capita government expenditure on health (at average exchange rate)	\$7	\$3076	\$20	\$204	\$ 2242

(Source: S. No. 1- 3, WDR -2009; 5 to 9, SWC -2009 and S. No. 10 &11 World Health Statistics 2009 published by WHO)

Table -11 **Health Indicators of 5 largest economies in the world (at PPP)**

	USA	China	Japan	India	Germany
1. Total Population (millions)	302	1320	128	1123	82
2. Total GNI at PPP (billion \$)	\$13,829	\$7083.5	4,420.6	3078.7	2782.7
3. Population BPL (\$1.25 pppd)	--	15.9%	--	41.6%	-
4. Infant with low birth weight	8%	2%	8%	28%	7
5. Life expectancy at birth	78 yr	73 yr	83 yr	64 yr	79
6. MMR	11	45	6	450	4
7. IMR	7	19	3	54	4
8. Under 5 year mortality rate	8	22	4	72	4
9. Total number of under 5 year deaths	34,000	3,82,000	4000	19,53,000	3,000
10. Government expenditure on health as % of total government	19.3%	9.9%	17.9%	3.4%	17.9%

expenditure					
11. Per capita government expenditure on health (at PPP)	\$3076	\$88	\$ 2097	22	2664

(Source: S. No. 1- 3, WDR -2009; 5 to 9, SWC -2009 and S. No. 10 &11 World Health Statistics 2009 published by WHO)

We can see from the above tables that not only India was the worst country in all the four group of countries in terms of health indicators but also in terms of government expenditure on health as % of total government expenditure.

Table -12 Under 5 year deaths rate from 2004 to 2008 in Five SA countries

	2004	2005	2006	2007
India	85	74	76	72
B'desh	77	73	69	61
Nepal	76	74	59	55
Sri Lanka	14	14	13	21
Maldives	46	12	30	30
World	79	76	72	68

Table – 13 Five largest child producing countries in the world

	Annual number Of births	% of low birth- weight children	Total number of infants with low birth weight in 2007
India	2,71,19,000	28%	75,93,320
China	1,73,74,000	2%	3,47,480
Nigeria	59,59,000	14%	8,34,260
Pakistan	44,46,000	19%	8,44,740
Indonesia	43,86,000	9%	3,94,740
Total above 5countries	5,92,84,000		1,00,14,540
World	13,57,70,000	14%	1,89,98,000

Table -14 **Share in global child birth and children born with low weight**

	Share in world's annual child birth	Share in world's low birth weight children
India	19.96%	39.97%
China	12.79%	1.83%
Nigeria	4.4%	4.39%
Pakistan	3.3%	4.45%
Indonesia	3.2%	2.1%
Total above 5	43.6%	52.7%
World	13,57,70,000	1,89,98,000 (100%)

Deprivation in Education:

Education, health and other essential services are necessary to enable people, especially the poor and vulnerable section of the population, to take advantage of economic opportunities, to improve their quality of life and to live with dignity. This is why the founding fathers of our Constitution had directed that:

“The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years.” (Art. 45)

In spite of the specific direction of the Constitution of India to the State to endeavour to provide free and compulsory education to all children until they complete the age of fourteen years, **within ten years of the commencement of this constitution**, the State in India has failed to fulfill this constitutional directive which was to be fulfilled by year 1960 (within ten years of the commencement of the constitution of India).

According to the World Development Report -2006, ‘Education is of great importance when assessing inequalities of opportunity. It is also an important determinant of individuals’ income, health (and that of their children) and capacity to interact and communicate with others. Inequalities in education thus contribute to inequalities in other important dimensions of well being.’ The Tenth Five Year Plan of India (2002-07) also highlighted the role of education when it says, ‘education is a crucial input in human resource development and is essential for the country’s economic growth. The literacy rate has been the major determinant of the rise or fall in other social and economic indicators.’

Although, Education is a necessary and one of the most important inputs required for a person to take advantage of economic and political opportunities, to improve

the quality of life and to live with dignity, hundreds of millions of Indians are illiterates or have not received education even up to 8th class. According to the Approach Paper to the 11th Five Year Plan of the Government of India, there are around 300 million adult illiterates in India. The importance of education is also emphasized by the Supreme Court of India in the following words:

“Victories are gained, peace is preserved, progress is achieved, civilization is built up and history is made not on the battlefields where ghastly murders are committed in the name of patriotism, not in the Council Chambers where insipid speeches are spun out in the name of debate, not even in the factories where are manufactured novel instruments to strangle life, but in educational institutions which are the seed-beds of culture, where children in whose hands quiver the destinies of the future, are trained...” (Unni Krishnan, JP v. State of AP, AIR SC page 2188 Para 14)”

According to the Supreme Court of India, “The objective of the people in establishing the Constitution was to promote justice, social and economic, liberty and equality. The modus operandi to achieve these objectives is set out in Part III and IV of the Constitution...Each of these parts represent in the main the statements in one sense of certain aspirations whose fulfillment was regarded as essential to the kind of society which the Constitution makers wanted to build...The task of protecting and realizing these right is imposed upon all the organs of the State, namely legislature, executive and judicial...”

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, who was the Prime minister of India at the beginning and the end of the said ten years time, did not even care to give reasons for the failure of the State for not providing the free and compulsory education to all children till the age of fourteen years at the end of ten year period in year 1960. He just kept quite over this great act of sacrileges on the Constitution of India. There was no outrages either in the Parliament or in the State Assemblies against the government (almost all the state governments were run by the Congress Party for the first 20 years since independence and the Congress Party was in power at the Centre for the first 30 years of independence) in not fulfilling the only time bound directive of the Constitution of India. The first justification for not fulfilling the constitutional directive came in year 1966, through the Report of the Education Commission (1964-66):

[The] Fulfilment of the Constitutional Directive [should have been achieved by 1960]. But in view of the immense difficulties involved such as lack of adequate resources, tremendous increase in population, resistance to the education of girls, large number of children of the backward classes, general poverty of the people and illiteracy and apathy of the parents, it was not possible to make adequate progress in primary education, and the Constitutional Directive has remained unfulfilled. (Kothari Commission Report 1964-66 page 151)

Let me quote the observation of Supreme Court of India in Mohini Jain case on the importance of education, Constitutional priorities and the working of the democracy in India:

“In these days, it is doubtful any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education...We agree with the observation that without education being provided to the citizens of this country the objective set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution cannot be achieved. The Constitution would fail... A true democracy is one where education is universal, where people understand what is good for them and the nation and knows how to govern themselves...”

“...It is noteworthy that among the several articles in Part IV (Directive Principle of State Policy), only article 45 speaks of a time-limit; no other article does. Has it no significance? Is it a mere pious wish, even after 44 years of the Constitution? Can the State flout the said direction even after 44 years on the ground that the article merely calls upon it to “endeavour to provide” the same and on the further ground that the said article is not enforceable by virtue of the declaration in Article 37... In this context, we feel constrained to say that allocation of available funds to different sectors of education in India discloses an inversion of priorities indicated by the Constitution. The Constitution contemplated a crash programme being undertaken by the State to achieve the goal set out in Article 45...What has actually happened is – more money is spent and more attention is directed to higher education than to – and at the cost of – primary education. (By primary education, we mean the education, which a normal child receives by the time he completes 14 years of age)...Although the declared purpose was to give priority to the increase of elementary schooling in order to raise the rate of literacy in the population, what has actually happened is that secondary schooling has been rising much faster and tertiary schooling has increased still more rapidly. There is a fairly general tendency for planned targets of increased primary schooling not to be reached, whereas targets are over-reached sometimes substantially, as regards increases in secondary and, particularly, tertiary schooling...What we see functioning here is the distortion of development from planned targets under the influence of the pressure from parents and pupils in the upper strata who everywhere are politically powerful...We do realize that ultimately it is question of resources and resources wise this country is not in a happy position. All we are saying is that while allocating the available resources, due regard should be had to the wise words of Founding Fathers in Article 45 and 46”. (From the SC Judgement in Unni Krishnan, JP v. State of AP, pages 2231, 2232 and 2234 of AIR SC)

According to the Approach paper to 11th Five Year Plan (FYP) “...Education, in its broadest sense of development of youth, including sports, is the most critical input

for empowering people with skills and knowledge and for giving them access to productive employment in the future...

“...We should also note that just 28% of our schools had electricity in 2005 and only about half had more than two teachers or two class rooms. Only 40% of primary school teachers were graduates and 30% had not even completed Higher Secondary. For a large proportion of our children, school is therefore an ill-lit classroom with more than one class being taught together by someone who may not have completed her own schooling...” (Approach Paper 11th FYP)

“...The 11th Plan should ensure that we move towards raising public spending in education to 6% of GDP...It must fulfill the Constitutional obligation of providing free, compulsory and good quality elementary education to all children up to the age of 14 years.” (Approach Paper 11th FYP)

Education can be a tool for bringing economic equality in a nation and it can also be a tool to increase economic inequality in a country as it is the most critical input for empowering people with skills and knowledge and for giving them access to productive employment in future. The illiterate, who are generally from the economically and socially deprived sections of society, stay poor and deprived because they are illiterate and because they are poor and deprived they stay illiterate or semi-literate. This vicious circle of illiteracy, poverty and deprivation can only be broken with free and good quality education to all at least up to high school level.

In spite of the fact that the Constitution of India has directed the State to provide free and compulsory education to all children till the age of fourteen years by 1960, India is home to the largest number of illiterate in the world and also that India is one among the very few countries in the world with lowest adult literacy rate, the government expenditure on education in India is one of the lowest in the world. The following table shows the public expenditure on education for India, world and developing countries,

The adult literacy rate in India (aged 15 years and above) was 66% whereas in the world adult literacy rate was around 81%. Even in developing countries the adult literacy rate (79%) was much higher than India's adult literacy rate (66%). Similarly, female youth literacy rate (percentage of literates female in the age group of 15 and 24 years) was one of the lowest in India. Female youth literacy rate in India was 77%, it was 84% in Uganda, 85% in Nigeria, 84% in all developing countries and 85% in the world. Although we take pride in being world's largest democracy, but when it comes to literacy and youth literacy, the performance of even the non-democratic countries like China, Egypt, Viet Nam and Myanmar is much better than India. The youth illiteracy in democratic India was (23.7%), China (1.1%), Egypt (15.1%), Viet Nam (6.1%) and Myanmar (5.5%). The following table shows India position in adult literacy and youth literacy rate as compared to world and developing countries.

Table -15 **Adult illiteracy rate India and other regions**

	Adult literacy rate
India	66%
Tanzania	72%
Uganda	74%
All Developing countries	79%
Middle East and North Africa	75%
East Asia and Pacific	93%
Latin America and Caribbean	91%
CEE/CIS	97%
World	81%

(Source: State of the World's Children – 2009)

Table – 16 **Literacy rate and public expenditure on education**

	India	Developing countries	World
Adult literacy rate	66%	79%	81%
Female Youth literacy rate	77%	84%	85%
Total public expenditure on education as% of total government expenditure	11%	16%	15%
Total public expenditure on education as % of GNP	3.3%	4.4%	4.9%

(Source: State of the World's Children 2009 for literacy rate; and Education for All Global Monitoring Report -2009, page 368 and 370; Table 11 for public spending on education)

1. More than forty years ago the First Education Commission (Kothari Commission - 1964-66) recommended that 6% of GNP should be devoted to public expenditure on education.
2. National Policy on Education -1986 (NPE -1986) had underlined that from Eighth Five Year Plan onwards, the public expenditure on education will uniformly exceed 6 per cent of the national income.
3. The National Common Minimum Programme – 2004 of the UPA government has mentioned the need of increasing the public spending on education to at least 6% of the GDP
4. The Approach Paper to the 11th FYP has stated that the 11th Plan should ensure that we move towards raising public spending on education to 6% of GDP ... to fulfill the constitutional obligation of providing free and compulsory elementary education of good quality to all children up to the age of 14'. (Para 4.3).

But according to the Economic Survey 2008-09 published by the government of India in July 2009 total public expenditure on education in India for year 2008-09 was Rs. 1,60,642 cr. which was only 3.02% of GDP. In this Rs. 1,60,642 cr public spending on education the share of union government was Rs. 37,366 cr. or only around 0.7% of the GDP. It may be noted here that it was only the union government which for the past more than four decades has been talking of raising the public spending on education to 6% of the GDP while it has allocated an average of 0.6% of the GDP in the past 6 years in the union budget! The same is the story with the allocation for health which was only around 1.4% of India's GDP and in this the share of the union government was only around 0.4% of the GDP for the past 5 years whereas average global public spending on health was around 5% of the world GDP.

We have seen in the above section that the lives of hundreds of millions of Indian citizens are blighted by extreme poverty, deprivation and ill-health. India is one of the most poverty stricken, disease ridden and illiterate countries in the world. A large proportion of Indian citizens are being deprived of good and quality education, good health and has to suffer from diseases and morbidity which can be easily prevented with known and cost effective methods and treatment. Most of the diseases from which the people of India suffer are poverty-related and primarily affect the poor and vulnerable groups. In spite of the fact that there are cost effective interventions to tackle these diseases, they have been neglected because of insufficient resources and ineffective implementation of programmes. The resources for tackling these deprivations and diseases are insufficient, not because there is a dearth of adequate resources, but because the available national resources are being spent on either some fashionable projects or on the so-called national security.

Now, when poverty, ill-health, illiteracy and other economic deprivations have been blighting and destroying a large number of lives in India, how to finance the major investment required for basic health care, nutrition and for primary education in India? Poverty of resources, it is being said, is the cause for the neglect of investment in these sectors of human priorities. But if we see the budget allocation of the governments of India, we will find that it is not the poverty of resources but lack of political will and courage to allocate sufficient public resources for those neglected citizens who need them the most. And even if it is the poverty of resources, it is expected from the governments of India to spend whatever scarce economic resources are available, on protecting people's lives from deaths diseases and deprivations. Are the resources available to the government of India so insufficient that it is unable to do much in this regard? In the next part we shall see how much resources are available with the governments of India and where these scarce economic resources are being spent by the government?

For Whose DEFENCE ?

(India's life threatening defence expenditure)

By Jasvir Singh

**Foundation for educational innovations in Asia –FEDINA
(August 2009)**

India's Defence expenditure

"...Our Statesmen have for over two generations declaimed against the heavy expenditure on armaments under the British regime, but now that freedom from political serfdom has come, our military expenditure has increased and still threatens to increase and of this we are proud! There is not a voice raised against it in our legislative chambers..."
(**M.K. Gandhi** in Harijan, December 7, 1947)

"...Out of 350 crores of rupees of revenue we raise annually, we spend about 180 crores of rupees on the Army. It is a colossal expenditure which has hardly any parallel. This colossal expenditure is the direct result of our foreign policy...On 15th of August 1947, when we began our life as an independent country there was no country which wished us ill. Every country in the world was our friend. Today, after four years, all our friends have deserted us. We have no friends left. We have alienated ourselves..." (Dr. **BR Ambedkar**: Writings and Speeches Page 1317 -1327, Annexure 1, dated 10-10 1951)

In 1938-39, the total expenditure of the central government out of revenues was Rs. 121 crores. The expenditure on debt services was Rs. 14 crores, on defence Rs. 52 crores and on civil administration Rs. 17 crores, that is, altogether Rs. 83 crores, or nearly 70 per cent. The warning of Indian leaders who urged the need of industrial development and pointed out the unfairness of excessive expenditure on the army, the civil administration and the debt charges, were not heeded. (Tara Chand (1972) History of Freedom Movement, Volume 4, Government of India)

According to Prof. Dharma Kumar editor of the Cambridge Economic History of India; " it was a standard accusation of the critics of the Raj that the costs of defence and administration was too high in relation to value received..." According to this book, the defence expenditure normally fluctuated between 2 and 3 per cent of national income of British India. For whole of India (British and Princely States), the proportion of national income spent on defence was lower than 2 or 3 per cent.

According to the HDR -2006, India was among the 58 poorest countries in the world. (Countries with per capita GDP at PPP less than \$ 3140 as per the HDR - 2006), but its total defence expenditure was huge. It was huge in absolute amount, huge as percentage of its GDP and also as the percentage of total government expenditure spent on defence. In the following table we can see India's defence expenditure from 1998-99 to 2009-10:

Table -10 India's defence expenditure from 1998-99 to 2009-10

	Defence expenditure	Total expenditure	Increase in expenditure of the Union govt.	Increase in total exp. over last year	Column 5 defence exp. as % of over last year column 4
1998-99	Rs. 41,200 cr.	Rs. 2,68,107 cr			
1999-00	Rs. 47,071 cr.	Rs. 3,07,509 cr.	Rs. 39402 cr	Rs. 5871 cr	15%
2000-01	Rs. 49,622 cr.	Rs. 3,25,592 cr.	Rs. 18083 cr.	Rs. 2551 cr	14%
2001-02	Rs. 54,266 cr.	Rs. 3,62,310 cr.	Rs. 36718 cr.	Rs. 4644 cr	13%
2002-03	Rs. 55,662 cr.	Rs. 4,13,248 cr.	Rs. 50938 cr	Rs. 1396 cr	3%
2003-04	Rs. 60,066 cr.	Rs. 4,71,203 cr.	Rs. 57955 cr.	Rs. 4404 cr	8%
2004-05	Rs. 75,856 cr.	Rs. 4,98,252 cr.	Rs. 27049 cr.	Rs. 15790 cr	58%
2005-06	Rs. 80,549 cr.	Rs. 5,05,738 cr.	Rs. 7486 cr.	Rs. 4693 cr.	63%
2006-07	Rs. 85,510 cr.	Rs. 5,83,387 cr.	Rs. 77649 cr.	Rs. 4961 cr.	6%
2007-08	Rs. 91681 cr.	Rs. 7,12,732 cr.	Rs. 129345 cr	Rs. 6171 cr	5%
2008-09	Rs. 1,14,600 cr	Rs. 9,00,953 cr.	Rs. 188221 cr	Rs. 22,919 cr	12%
2009-10	Rs. 1,41,703 cr	Rs. 10,20,838 cr.	Rs. 119885 cr	Rs. 27103 cr	23%

(Source: Budget Papers of the Union government for various years. Column 4 is increase of total central government expenditure over the previous year, column 5 is the increase of total defence expenditure over the previous year and column 6 is % increase in total central government expenditure spent on defence expenditure)

We can see from the above Table that India's defence expenditure increased from Rs. 41,200 cr in 1998-99 to Rs. 1,41,703 cr in 2009-10 budget, an increase of Rs. 1,00503 cr. (more than Rupees one lakh crore over and above of the defence budget of Rs. 41,200 cr in year 1998-99. India's total expenditure on defence in the past 10 years since 2000-01 was Rs. 8,09,515 cr. It increased from Rs. 49,622 cr in 2000-01 to Rs. 1,41,703 cr in year 2009-10, an increase of more than Rs. 92,000 cr over and above the 2000-01 defence budget (of Rs. 49,622 crores). The total expenditure of the Union government during these 10 years was Rs. 57,26,646 cr. and the total expenditure on defence during these ten years was Rs. 8,09,515 cr. In another words, the average spending of the Union government on defence expenditure during the past 10 years was around 14.14% of the total expenditure of the Union government. If we take the total allocation for Ministry of Defence for year 2009-10 (Rs. 1,66,663 cr.), it would come to more than 16% of the total spending of the Union government. The allocation for Union Ministry of Health & Family Welfare (Rs. 22,641.33 cr.) was only 2.2% of the total spending of the Union government for year 2009-10.

From the table above on India's defence expenditure and total central government expenditure, we can see that the total central government expenditure increased from Rs. 4,71,203 cr. in 2003-04 to Rs. 4,98,252 cr. in 2004-05 or the total expenditure of the central government increased by Rs. 27,049 cr. but the defence expenditure increased from Rs. 60,066 cr in 2003-04 to Rs. Rs. 75,856 cr. in 2004-05 or an increase of Rs. 15,790 cr. This means more than 58% of the increase in

the total central government expenditure in the first year of the UPA government (2004-05) was spent on the defence. Similarly, the total increase in the central government expenditure in 2005-06 over 2004-05 was Rs. 7,486 cr. and the total increase in the defence expenditure in 2005-06 over 2004-05 was Rs. 4,693 crores. This means around 63% of the increase in central government's expenditure was spent on defence in the second year of the UPA rule. It may be noted here that year 2004-05 and 2005-06 were the first two years of the UPA government and the increase in defence expenditure as % of increase in the total central government expenditure in these two years was the highest in the past more than one decade. It may also be kept in mind that the years 2003, 2004 and 2005 were the years when the relation between India and Pakistan was one of the best and the year 1998-99 was the year of Kargil war.

The people in India are made to believe by our ruling politicians that India's defence expenditure is one of the lowest in the world. To spread this half truth and lie, our 'strategic experts' are producing their research papers showing that India is not spending adequate amount on defence as compared to other countries. Now let us see whether our defence expenditure has really been one of the lowest in the world in terms of percentage of our GDP?

The Human Development Report -2006, published by the United Nation's Development Programme (UNDP) has listed 177 countries of the world and according to this report India's defence expenditure was 3% of the GDP. Out of these 177 countries, the defence expenditure of 106 countries was less than 3% of the GDP. In only 24 countries (out of 177 countries), the defence expenditure was 3% or more of the GDP. 45 countries had not given their defence expenditure in this list. In at least 30 countries, the defence expenditure was 1% or below of their GDP. There were four countries which were spending 0% of their GDP on defence and another at least six countries which were spending 0.5% or less on their defence. This shows that India's defence expenditure was not one of the lowest but one of the highest in the world.

India is one of the 58 countries in the world whose PCGDP at purchasing power parity (PPP) was below \$ 3140 according to the HDR -2006. In 31 of these 58 poorest countries defence expenditure was below 3% and in only 6 countries it was 3% or above of the GDP. 21 countries had not given their defence expenditure. This means India was one among the 6 highest defence spenders even in the poorest 58 countries.

India was one among the 89 democratic countries in the world. There were at least 54 democratic countries whose expenditure on defence was below 3% of GDP and in only 7 democratic countries it was 3% or above of the GDP (defence expenditure based on HDR -2006). 28 democratic countries had not given their defence expenditure. This means even among the 89 democratic countries India was one among the 7 largest defence spenders as percentage of the GDP.

Let us now see the defence expenditure of world largest populated countries, largest economies and the largest democracies as percentage of their GDP

Table -11 Defence expenditure of 5 largest populated countries

	China	India	USA	Indonesia	Brazil
1. Total Population in 2004 (in Million)	1308	1087	295	220	184
2. Defence expenditure as % of GDP	2.4%	3.0%	4.0%	1.1%	1.5%

(Source: Total population and defence expenditure based on HDR -2006)

Table -12 Defence expenditure of 5 largest democracies in the world

	India	USA	Indonesia	Brazil	Japan
Total Population in 2004 (millions)	1087	295.4	220	184	128
Defence expenditure as % of GDP	3.0%	4.0%	1.1%	1.5%	1.0%

(Source: Total population and defence expenditure based on HDR -2006)

Table -13 Defence expenditure of 5 largest economies in the world (at PPP)

	USA	China	Japan	India	Germany
2. Total GDP at PPP in 2004 (billion \$)	\$11,651	\$7642.	\$3,737	\$3390	\$2335.5
3. Defence expenditure as % of GDP	4.0%	2.4%	1.0%	3.0%	1.4%

(Source: Total GDP and defence expenditure based on HDR- 2006)

From the above 3 Tables, we can see that among the 5 largest populated countries in the world the defence expenditure of India and USA was the highest and in case of other three countries it was much below India's defence expenditure. If we take the defence expenditure of 5 largest democracies in the world; the defence expenditure of India and USA was the highest and in case of remaining three it was much lower. If we take the defence expenditure of 5 largest economies in the world (highest total GDP at PPP), the defence expenditure of India and USA was the highest and in case of remaining three countries it was much lower.

Now let us see the defence expenditure of India, USA and the world for the twenty year period from 1988 to 2007 at constant 2005 US \$

Table -14 Increase in Defence expenditure in 2007 over 1988

	1988	1998	2007	Increase in 2007 over 1988
World	\$1195 bn.	\$834 bn	\$1214 bn	1.6%
USA	\$484 bn	\$328 bn.	\$547 bn.	13%
India	\$11.4 bn.	\$14.7 bn.	\$24.25 bn.	114%
South Asia	\$15bn.	\$19.6 bn.	\$30.7 bn.	104%
South Asia (without India)	\$3.6 bn.	\$4.9 bn.	\$6.45 bn.	79%
World (without USA)	\$711 bn.	\$506 bn.	\$667 bn.	--6.4% (\$44 bn. reduction)

(Source: Based on SIPRI -2008 data. The above data is at constant 2005 prices and exchange rates)

From this table we can see that the increase in India defence expenditure between 1988 and 2007 was the highest when compared to the increase in defence expenditure of world, USA and South Asia during the same period. The increase in total global defence expenditure was only 1.6% during this period and in case of USA the increase was 13% between 1988 and 2007. If we take the South Asian region the increase in total defence expenditure of South Asia was 104% and if we take out India out of South Asia's defence expenditure, the increase in South Asia's (Minus India) defence expenditure between 1988 and 2007 was 79%. The other important point to note here is that India's defence expenditure was more than 3.2 times the total defence expenditure of all other South Asian nations in 1988; 3 times in 1998 and 3.7 times in 2007. India share in total world defence expenditure was 0.95% in 1988; 1.76% in 1998 and 2% in 2007.

When Gandhi ji wrote in Harijan in December 1947 against increased defence expenditure in the first Union Budget of independent India, the defence expenditure at that time was less than Rs. 100 crores. This year, the followers of Mahatma Gandhi have raised the defence budget to Rs. 1,41,703 crores.

Some Important facts about India's defence expenditure

1. According to SIPRI – 2009, total world defence expenditure was 2.4% of world's GDP but India's defence expenditure was 2.5% of India's GDP. India's expenditure on Ministry of Defence was More than 2.8% of India's GDP (based on allocation for Defence Ministry and the total GDP of India according to the Budget papers of union government in India for year 2008-09 and 2009-10)
2. Government spending on health globally as percentage of world GDP was 5%. But government spending on health in India (Union government and all State governments) as percentage of India's GDP was only 1.4% (Economic Survey- 2008-09, Government of India)

3. Globally, the total public health expenditure was more than double the total global defence expenditure. Total global defence expenditure was \$1339 billions in 2007 (SIPRI - 2008) and total global government expenditure on health was \$ 2836.5 billion (calculated on the basis of World Health Statistics -2009 published by WHO). But in India the total government spending on health (by union government and all State governments) was less than half of the total defence expenditure.

Total government expenditure on health and defence

	Total government Expenditure on defence	Total government expenditure on health
India	\$30 bn.	\$8 bn.
US	\$607 bn.	\$929 bn.
China	\$85 bn.	\$50 bn.
France	\$66 bn.	\$196 bn.
UK	\$65 bn.	\$177 bn.
Brazil	\$23.3 bn.	\$39 bn.
world	\$1339 bn.	\$2836 bn.

(Source: SIPRI 2009 for defence expenditure and World Health Statistics 2009 for total government expenditure on health)

4. India's share in world's total defence expenditure was 2.1% (SIPRI -2009). But when it comes to health, India's share in world's total health expenditure was only 0.28% (calculated on the Basis of WHS -2009, published by WHO)
5. Total allocation for Ministry of Defence in the Union Budget 2009-10 was Rs. 1,66,663 cr and for Ministry of Health & Family Welfare the total allocation in the 2009-10 Union Budget was only Rs. 22,641cr. This means Central government's allocation for Ministry of Defence was **more than 7 times** than the total allocation for Ministry of Health & FW.
6. Percentage of Central government expenditure allocated to defence in India was around 13% and for health around 2%. But in the United States the % of Central government expenditure allocated to health was 24% and for defence it was 20%. In other words the Central government in the US was spending more on health than what it was for defence as can be seen from the following table:

	India	US
% of Central government expenditure allocated to defence	13%	20
% of Central government expenditure allocated to health	2%	24%

(Source: State of World's Children Report - 2007 published by UNICEF)

7. India was one of the four countries (India, Burundi, Pakistan and Congo Democratic Republic) in the world in which public spending on health was less than 1.5% of their GDP and Defence spending was 3% or more of their GDP. But for India, there was no other democratic country in the world whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of GDP and defence expenditure was 3% or above. (Based on HDR -2006)
8. India's share in total under 5 year deaths in the world was 21% (19,53,000 under 5 year deaths in India out of a total of 92,16,000 under 5 year deaths in the world as per SWC -2009), and India's total government health expenditure was only 0.3% of the total government expenditure on health globally. But India's total defence expenditure was 2% of the total world defence expenditure. It may be noted here that an additional \$10 per capita spending on health can save at least 66% of under 5 year deaths and 40% of deaths related to pregnancy in India. This means around 13 lakh deaths of children in can be prevented every year and around 25,000 deaths of those women who die due to pregnancy related problems. In other words 13,25,000 deaths in India could have been prevented in year 2007 if only \$ 10 per person additional was spent on health that year.

Table -15 India's share in world's disease and deaths

	India	world	India's share
Total under 5 yr deaths	19,53,000	92,16,000	21.2%
Total MMR	1,22,033	5,43,000	22.5%
Total government health expenditure	\$ 8 billion	\$2836 billion	0.28%
Total defence expenditure	\$22.3 billion	\$1120 billion	2%

9. India's defence expenditure in 2004 (according to HDR -2006) was 3% of India's GDP and USA defence expenditure was 4% of USA GDP. But India's public health expenditure as % of its GDP was only 1.2% whereas in case of USA it was 6.8% of their GDP (HDR -2006).
10. The defence expenditure of worlds richest (HIC) countries without USA was 1.9% of their GNP and in case of India it was more than 2.5% of India's GNP (based on SIPRI-2008 data and WDR -2009 data) This means India was spending a larger share of its GNP on defence than the richest countries in the world. But when it comes to government spending on health India was spending less than 1 % of its GNP whereas the HIC without USA were spending 6.5% of their GNP (based on WHS -2009 and WDR -2009). The government spending on health in all the HIC was 17.1% of the total government spending and in India, government spending on health was only 3.4% of the total government spending in India.

11. India was among the 10 largest spenders on defence (SIPRI -2009). But in India, total number of under 5 year deaths were more than 4 times than the combined under 5 years deaths in all other countries in this list of 10 largest spenders on defence. India was the only country among these 10 largest spenders on defence in which the government spending on health was below 4%. There were 7 democratic countries in this list of 10 largest spenders on defence (including India) and government spending on health as % of total government spending in all other countries (except India) was above 14%. Even in non-democratic countries the government spending on health as % of total government spending was much higher than it was in India (China 9.9%, Russia 10.8%, Saudi Arabia 8.7% and India 3.4%)

Table -16 10 largest spenders on defence in the world

	Total number of Defence expenditure	Govt. expenditure on under 5 year deaths	Health as % of total exp.
1. USA	\$607 billions	34,000 (8)	19.3%
2. China	\$84.9 billions	3,82,000 (22)	9.9%
3. France	\$65.7 billions	3,000 (4)	16.7%
4. UK	\$65.3 billions	4,000 (6)	16.3%
5. Russia	\$58.6 billions	23,000 (15)	10.8%
6. Germany	\$46.8 billions	3,000 (4)	17.9%
7. Japan	\$46.3 billions	4,000 (4)	17.9%
8. Italy	\$40.6 billions	2,000 (4)	14.2%
9. Saudi Arabia	\$38.2 billions	15,000 (25)	8.7%
10. India	\$30.0 billions	19,53,000 (72)	3.4%
		Total deaths 24,23000	

(Figures in brackets are under 5 year mortality rate. This table is constructed on the basis of data from SIPRI -2009 for Defence and SWC -2009 for under 5 year deaths. Last column data for government spending on health as % of total government spending is taken from WHS -2009)

There were only 26 countries out of a total of 177 countries whose spending on defence was 3% or more of their GDP according to HDR -2006. Similarly, there were only 21 countries out of 177 countries listed in HDR -2006, whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of their GDP. In the following two tables we are giving the details of these 26 countries whose spending on defence was 3% or more of their GDP and the 21 countries whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of the GDP

Table -17 26 countries with 3% or more spending of GDP on defence

Income group	Democracies	Non-democracies	All
HIC	4	5	9
MIC	2	9	11
LIC	1	5	6
Total	7	19	26

Table -18 Public spending on Health below 1.5% of GDP (21 countries)

Income group	Democracies	Non-democracies	All
HIC	0	0	0
MIC	1	3	4
LIC	2	15	17
Total	3	18	21

(Source: Based on HDR-2006 for defence and health spending and Freedom House Survey on free and not free countries)

As we can see from the above two tables; 19 of the 26 countries whose spending on defence was 3% or more were non-democracies and only 7 were democracies. Among 7 democracies whose spending on defence was 3% or more India was the only democracy which belonged to the Low Income Countries group. Other countries from LIC spending 3% or more on defence were Pakistan, Burundi, Yemen, Angola, Congo D.R. and India. The 21 countries where public spending on health was below 1.5% of the GDP only 3 were democracies and 18 non-democracies. Two of these three democratic countries whose public spending on health was less than 1.5% of their GDP were from the LIC and one from the MIC. India was one of the two democracies from LIC whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of the GDP and the other was Ghana. The third democratic country whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of GDP was Indonesia which belonged to the Middle Income group countries. It may be noted here that the defence spending as % of GDP in Ghana and Indonesia was also below 1.5% (Ghana it was 0.8% and Indonesia it was 1.1%). Similarly of the 7 democracies whose spending on defence was 3% or above, the public spending on health in 6 of these 7 countries was also 3% or above of the GDP and only in India it was below 1.5% (US 6.8%; Israel 6.1%; Chile 3.0%; Greece 5.1%; Botswana 3.3%; Namibia 4.5% and India 1.2%)

- Out of 177 countries listed in the HDR -2006, defence expenditure of 56 countries was below 1.5% of the GDP and in only 26 countries it was 3% or above. India was one among the 26 countries whose spending on defence was 3% or above.
- Out of 177 countries listed in the HDR -2006, public spending on health was 3% or more in 90 countries and in only 21 countries it was below 1.5%. India

was one among the 21 countries whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of the GDP.

- Among the 89 democratic countries, only 7 countries' spending on defence was 3% or above and in 28 countries it was below 1.5%. India was among the 7 democracies whose spending on defence was 3% or above of the GDP.
- Among 89 democracies, there were only 3 democracies whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of the GDP and in another 62 democracies the public spending on health was 3% or more of their GDP. India was among the 3 democracies whose public spending on health was below 1.5% of GDP.
- There were 58 low income countries (LIC) where PCGDP at PPP was below \$3140 as per HDR -2006. Among these 58 LIC, only in 6 countries the defence expenditure was 3% or more and in 19 countries it was below 1.5% of the GDP. India was among the 6 countries whose defence spending was 3% or above.
- Among 58 LIC, there were 13 countries in which public spending on health was 3% or above and another 15 countries in which public spending on health was below 1.5% of GDP. India was among the 15 countries whose public spending on health was below 1.5%. (14,885 words)

What is the appropriate defence expenditure?

Whenever there is a talk of spending less on defence expenditure a stock response is that we cannot afford to spend less on defence as it would jeopardize our national security. Now the question arises as to how much defence expenditure is necessary to assure security to a nation? There is also a related question to this: Is it only the expenditure on defence which can assure security to a nation? In year 2000 the total defence expenditure of USA was \$322 billion (or \$ 1137 per annum for each US citizen). The total defence expenditure of India was \$11,821 million in year 2000 (or less than \$12 per person per year). The total defence expenditure of Bangladesh was \$639 million in year 2000 (or less than \$5 per person per year). But, in spite of spending huge amount on defence, (around 100 times more per person on defence than India and more than 200 times more per person on defence than Bangladesh), the US was not secure. The security of United States was threatened by Afghanistan (as claimed by the US) in year 2001. It may be noted here that the total GDP of Afghanistan at that time was only around US\$ 5 billion and the defence expenditure of Afghanistan at that time was not more than US\$ 0.5 billion. In other words, in spite of spending 600 times more on its defence than Afghanistan the United States failed to assure security to its people and the nation. After this incident, the Vice-President of the United States said, " ... It is almost impossible to erect a hundred per cent defence... In my opinion the

prospects of a future attack against the United States are almost certain. It is not a matter of 'if' but '**when**'..." (Emphasis added)

Peace, development and prosperity: Our strategic analysts generally argue that peace is most essential for the well being of the people of India and force is required to maintain peace. Force, according to them, is one of the most important requirements to keep peace; hence the importance of arms and armies which are maintained to fight against any internal or external threat to peace. There argument runs like this: Higher spending on defence brings security, security brings peace and peace leads to economic development and prosperity for all. Let us examine this argument.

It is true that peace is one of the most important requirements for development, prosperity and wellbeing of the people of a country but the argument that peace can be maintained only through arms and armies is difficult to digest. There are two fundamental problems with dependence on arms and armies for peace; first, arms and armies by nature are undemocratic and a symbol of violence, and has vested interests in strife, hatred and enmity as their very existence depends on hatred, strife and enmity; second, to maintain arms and armies needs diversion of huge economic resources from other productive use and well-being of the people to arms and armies.

According to the Brandt Commission (1983), "...In fact military expenditure is very much more a part of the world's economic problems than its solution. At any given level of public expenditure, the higher the proportion of spending devoted to weapons procurements, the smaller the amount of employment created..." In 1995, the world and South Asia was more secure with a defence expenditure of \$ 855billion and \$17.5 billions respectively than ten year latter in year 2005 when the world defence expenditure was around \$1113 billions and defence expenditure of South Asia was around \$28.2 billions (defence data for both year is based on SIPRI -2008). Today's world and South Asia is more insecure and strife-ridden because we are seeking security and peace by spending more on arms and armies. Here it would be worthy to remember the warning of the World Commission on Environment and Development, OUP (1987) that, '... Competitive arms race breeds insecurity among nations through spirals of reciprocal fears. Nations need to muster resources to combat environmental degradation and mass poverty. By misdirecting scarce resources, arms race contributes further to insecurity..."

Defence spending and peace: Now let us see whether spending more on defence promote peace and security? Let us take the case of 10 countries which were spending largest amount on defence and see how peaceful and secure they were.

Table 19 Relation between defence spending and peace

		Defence Expenditure	Peace rank	10 most peaceful countries	Peace rank
1.	USA	\$607 bn	83	New Zealand	1
2.	China	\$85 bn.	74	Denmark	2
3.	France	\$66 bn.	30	Norway	3
4.	UK	\$65 bn.	35	Iceland	4
5.	Russia	\$59 bn.	136	Austria	5
6.	Germany	\$47 bn.	16	Sweden	6
7.	Japan	\$46 bn.	7	Japan	7
8.	Italy	\$41 bn.	36	Canada	8
9.	S. Arabia	\$38 bn.	104	Finland	9
10.	India	\$30 bn.	122	Slovenia	10
	Total	\$1084			
	World	\$1464 bn.			

(Source: SIPRI -2009, for 10 largest spenders on defence and Global Peace Index -2009 (GPI -2009))

From the above table we can see that USA which was spending \$607 billion (41% of world's total defence expenditure) on its defence was ranked 83rd in the list of 144 countries (country most at peace is ranked one and least at peace ranked 144) in the world ranked by the GPI - 2009. (Country most at peace is ranked one and least at peace is ranked 144). The share of the ten largest spenders on defence (\$1084 bn.) in total world defence expenditure (\$1464 bn.) was 74%. The most peaceful country in the world was New Zealand and its total defence expenditure was less than \$1.5 billion. But for Japan there was no other country from the 10 largest spenders on defence in the 10 most peaceful countries in the world. The other important fact about the 10 most peaceful countries is that the combined total defence expenditure of these 10 most peaceful countries in the world was less than \$ 95 billion, and for 9 of these 10 countries the total defence expenditure was below \$45bn. If peace was dependent on arms and armies than the 10 largest spenders on arms and armies would have been the most peaceful countries in the world but the fact is that but for Japan all other countries were not in the list of 10 most peaceful countries. Japan was also the only country in the list of 10 largest spenders of defence whose defence expenditure as % of its GDP was the lowest (1% of the GDP) in the list of 10 largest spenders on defence. Keeping in mind the above facts we can safely say that spending more on defence does not generally promote peace and security.

The security phobia created in India by the vested interests, does not create possibilities for peace, but it surely creates possibilities for strife, violence and war. We can learn from the experiences of Costa Rica, Japan and Luxemburg on how to stay more secure as a nation. All these countries are more secure by spending less or nothing on defence. The then President of Costa Rica, **Mr. Jose Figueres**, abolished army in 1948 to show a new path to the world that nations can live in a

much better and more secure way without armies. The whole defence budget was transferred to the Education Ministry at one stroke. On the other hand India, whose government leaders claims to be the true followers of Mahatma Gandhi, has made India the 10th largest spender on defence by keeping millions of its people hungry, illiterate and vulnerable to disease and death.

Today, Costa Rica, even with its \$5560 per capita income, performs as better as the US, and in some cases even better than the US, (although per capita income of US is \$46,040) in assuring better quality life to its citizens. Costa Rica as a nation is more secure without spending even a single \$ on army than the US which has allocated more than \$ 500 billion for defence in year 2005. Costa-Rica, as can be seen from the following table, is not only living without the armies for the past many decades but also providing a much better and secure life to its people. It may be noted here that the total GNI of Costa Rica in year 2007 was less than \$ 25 billion whereas the total defence expenditure of the USA was more than 500 billions! In other words USA's defence expenditure in year 2007 was 20 times the total GNI or Costa Rica.

Table - 20 Life with and without armies

	Costa- Rica	United States	World
Per capita gross national income	\$5560	\$46,040	\$7952
Life expectancy at birth	79 years	78 years	68 years
Under 5 year mortality rate	11	8	68
Infant mortality rate	10	7	47
Maternal mortality ratio	30	11	400
% of skilled attendant at delivery	99%	99%	62%
% of infants with low birth weight	7%	8%	14%
Defence expenditure as % of GDP	0	4%	2.5%

(Source: For defence expenditure SIPRI – 2008; for all other SWC - 2009)

Apart from Costa-Rica the other example to follow are Japan and Luxemburg. In both these countries, the defence expenditure is one percent or below of the GDP. In year 2004, the defence expenditure of Japan was 1% of the GDP and the defence expenditure of Luxemburg 0.9% of the GDP. There were at least 30 countries in the world whose defence expenditure as percentage of GDP was 1% or below according to the HDR -2006

Bangladesh showing the way in South Asia

Bangladesh is also showing the way to the countries of South Asia by keeping its defence budget between 1.0 and 1.4% of its GDP for the past more than 15 years. The percentage of central government expenditure allocated to defence in Bangladesh was 10%, the lowest in South Asia and for health and education it was 24%, the highest in South Asia as per the SWC-2009. It may be noted here that the total population of Pakistan was around 12% more than the total population of

Bangladesh but the defence expenditure of Pakistan was almost 6 times more than the defence budget of Bangladesh. Again the total population of India was 8 times more than the total population of Bangladesh but the defence budget of India was 24 times more than the defence budget of Bangladesh in year 2004. (SIPRI Yearbook 2005) The impact of Bangladesh's lower spending on defence can be seen on the quality of life of its people. Under -5 year mortality rate and Infant mortality rate was much lower in Bangladesh when compared to India or Pakistan despite the fact that the per capita GDP of Bangladesh was much lower than India and Pakistan. Apart from having better health indicators, Bangladesh as a nation was not less secure than either India or Pakistan.

Table -21 Health indicators of Bangladesh and India

	Bangladesh	India
Infants mortality rate	47	54
Under 5 year mortality rate	61	72
% of infants with low birth weight	22%	28%
% of one year old children immunized from T.B.	97%	85%
% of one year old children immunized from measles	88%	67%
Per capita GNI US \$ (2007)	\$470	\$950

(Source: SWC-2009)

Now, if Bangladesh, even with lower per capita income and much lower defence expenditure than India and Pakistan, can show same or better health results, and is not less secure as a nation than India and Pakistan, why India and Pakistan are spending huge amount on their defence to be less secure as a nation than Bangladesh? It may be noted here that per capita defence expenditure of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh was around \$14, \$24 and \$4 respectively in year 2004. This mean a nation in South Asia can be more secure with the per capita defence expenditure of \$ 4 (Bangladesh) in year 2004 than a nation with per capita defence expenditure of \$14 (India) or \$24 (Pakistan). It may be noted here that according to the Global Peace Index- 2008 (GPI 2008), Bangladesh was much more peaceful (GPI rank 90) than India (GPI rank 122) and Pakistan (GPI rank 137). According to the GPI - 2008, rank 1 is most peaceful and rank 144 is the least peaceful country. From South Asia India, Sri Lanka and Pakistan were in the list of 25 least peaceful countries in the world but Bangladesh was not in this list of 25 least peaceful countries in the world. There must be something very seriously wrong with the rulers of India and Pakistan who are spending much more on defence to stay much more insecure than Bangladesh. India and Pakistan by spending \$4 per capita on defence expenditure, (as is being spent by Bangladesh) can save more than \$13 billion every year and can be more secure as a nation than at present. And according to the UNDP \$ 4 billion additional is needed every year to finance basic health care interventions that could prevent the deaths of 30 lakh infants every

year! (HDR-2005 page 94) According to the same source, 'more than one billion people in the world lack access to clean water and 2.6 billion to sanitation. Overcoming these deficits would cost just under \$7 billion additional every year over the next decade. This investment could save some 4000 lives each day (or 14.60 lakh in a year) as a result of reduced exposure to infectious diseases.' (HDR-2005, page 93). This mean nearly 45 lakh deaths in the developing countries could be prevented if \$ 11 billion additional is invested every year on the above two sector. What can be better use of the \$13 billion saved every year by reduced defence expenditure of India and Pakistan? This amount can reduce 45 lakh deaths every year in developing countries and also India and Pakistan can be more secure as a nation like Bangladesh.

About Human security and national security: The concept of human security is much larger and broader than the concept of national security. Human security includes not only security of the nation but also the security of the people who live in the nation. The concept of national security, on the other hand, is more or mainly related to the security of the land area (territory) of a nation from external aggression or from internal disturbances. National security in this case has more to do with arms armies and police based security to the people of a nation. Human security on the other hand is about the total well-being, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings and protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. There can be many reasons for the threat to human security such as the threat from hunger, disease, inadequate/inappropriate shelter, unemployment, social conflicts, crimes and environmental hazards and also from external aggression. Military threat from outside the nation is only one and in many cases may not be the most significant threat to human security. This means the threat to human security exists even when there is no threat of external aggression. In some cases it may be possible that there is a tension between the security of the peoples' and the security of the nation or regime. In this way it can be said that human security is concerned with how people live in a society, how freely they exercise their many choices, how much access they have to market and social opportunities and whether they live in conflict or in peace. So, when we talk about human security, we not only talk about the threat of external aggression to a nation but also the threat to the right to live with human dignity of the people. The feeling of insecurity among people of a country may also arise from the worries of their daily life, for example; will they and their families have enough to eat? Will they lose their jobs? Will their streets and neighborhoods be safe from crime? Will they be harassed, humiliated or persecuted by the State or its institutions because of their religion, region, caste, class, gender, ethnic origin, language, political belief or opinion? The preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) adopted more than 5 decades ago by the General Assembly of the United Nations has proclaimed that freedom from fear and freedom from want are the highest aspiration of the common people. The Human Development Report (HDR) published every year by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) also

speaks about two major components of human security: (1) Freedom from fear and (2) Freedom from want.

Freedom from fear: Freedom from fear is an important component of human security but not the only component. The threat to freedom from fear comes when people fear of violation of their human rights or civil rights. Or the fear that they may be discriminated or persecuted due to their religion, caste, gender, language, religion, region or political belief, either by the State or its institutions or by the dominant group or people. The fear may also be of aggression by other country or social conflict. It can also be the fear of becoming victims of crime.

Freedom from want: The other equally important component of human security is freedom from want. The threat to freedom from want arises when people fear that the basic requirements of a dignified human existence would not be available to them because of one or the other reason. One of the major reasons for threat to freedom from want is the threat to their livelihood systems. The best way to in which the people can be assured of the freedom from want is that they get a regular and adequate income by doing some productive and useful work for the society. This not only provides the people a decent standard of life but they also contribute to the development of their nation.

According to the UNDP, both these components of human security; freedom from fear and freedom from want are of equal importance and human security can not be achieved at the cost of the other.

In this way we can say that human security means absence of threat to national security and people's security. But the nations are known to exaggerate the perceived threat to national security and to minimize the real threat to peoples' security. A large number of governments in the world are spending huge amount of available national resources to protect their citizens against the perceived threat of aggression by another country and on the maintenance of internal security machinery, in spite of the fact that poverty, ill-health, disease, illiteracy and lack of minimum social services continue to afflict hundreds of millions of their citizens. This type of solution to the perceived threat to national security instead of reducing the threat to human security will create conditions, which would increase the threat to human security in the name of its solution. This is so because when the huge amount of limited national resources are spent on the so-called threat to national security and resources left to deal with the actual threat to people's security from disease, poverty, hunger and unsafe drinking water etc. are not sufficient.

Union Budget 2009-10: Allocation for National security and Human security

Presentation of Annual Budget in India is a constitutional obligation under Article 112 of the Indian Constitution and it is to be prepared keeping in mind the Directive Principles of State Policy in the Constitution and not at the whims and fancies of the ruling party. Dr. Ambedkar in his reply during the debates in the Constituent Assembly underlined the fact that, "...whosoever captures power will not be free to do so whatever he likes with it. In the exercise of it (power), he will have to respect these instruments of instruction which are called Directive Principles..." Annual Budget is the most important policy document of the government which reveals the socio-economic priorities of the government. It shows the real intentions and priorities of the government and separates them from mere rhetoric. We have seen above that despite the constitutional promises of socio-economic justice and the right to live with dignity hundreds of millions of Indian citizens are living in extreme poverty and deprivation under sub-human conditions. Now if this is the state of India's citizens, it was expected from the democratic State in India to allocate adequate resources for health, education and on social security so that the vulnerable sections get basic amenities and opportunities for livelihood. But the budgetary allocation for these in the union budget since independence is grossly inadequate compared to the size of the problem.

Public spending is one of the most important tools in the hands of the governments to improve the quality of life of its citizens, who for one or the other reasons failed to take adequate advantage of economic growth. All modern governments; whether democratic or non-democratic, socialist or capitalist, rich or poor spends a significant amount of economic resources every year on public spending, which these governments gets through tax and non-tax revenue. The total public spending in India's current Union Budget (2009-10) is Rs. 10,20,838 crores. If this amount is equally distributed to all Indians; whether rich or poor, Tatas or slum-dwellers each Indian would get Rs. 8846 per annum (Rs.10,20,838 cr. / 115.4 cr. population = Rs. 8846 pa). In other words each Indian would be getting Rs. 24 per day out of the total public expenditure budgeted for year 2009-10. But still according to the government of India's estimates there were hundreds of millions of Indians who were living below Rs. 20 per day and this is despite the fact that nearly 40% of Indians were engaged in one or the other economic activity for livelihood.

Table -22 Allocation for national and peoples' security in the Union Budget

	2008-09	2009-10	% increase
Ministry of Health and FW	18,123 cr	22,641 cr	25%
Ministry of HRD	38,703 cr	44,528 cr	15%
Ministry of Defence	1,23,535 cr	1,66,663 cr	35%
Central Police (including IB,CBI & SPG)	22,592 cr	35,158 cr	55%
Ministry of Defence & Central Police	1,46,127 cr	2,01,821	38%
Ministry of HRD and Health & FW	56,856 cr	67,169 cr.	18%
Defence Research & Development Organisation (DRDO)	3394 cr.	4758 cr	40%
Department of Health Research	532 cr	606 cr	14%
Cancer Research	111 cr	86 cr.	(-- 22%)
National Disease Control Programme	1072 cr.	1063 cr	(--1%)
National TB Control Programme	263 cr.	296 cr	12.5%
Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Research	100 cr.	96 cr.	4%

- From the above Table we can see that the total allocation for National security (allocation for Ministry of Defence and for Central Police (including CBI, IB and SPG) increased from 1,46,127 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 2,01,821 crores in 2009-10. In other words an increase of more then 38% on national security in the Union Budget from previous year whereas the increase in the allocation for Union Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and the Union Ministry of HRD was only 18% from the previous year's allocation.
- Total allocation for Defence Research & Development Organisation (DRDO) in Union Budget increased from Rs. 3394 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 4758 crores in 2009-10, an increase of around 40%. But the increase in allocation for Department of Health Research (which is under Union Ministry of Health & FW) was from Rs. 532 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 606 crores in 2009-10 or merely 14% increase.
- The allocation for Cancer Research actually declined by around 22% from the previous year's allocation. It declined form Rs. 111 crore in 2008-09 to Rs. 86 crores in year 2009-10. It may be noted here that more than 4 lakh Indian die every year from cancer according to government of India's estimates.
- The increase in the allocation for the Ministry of HRD in 2009-10 was only 15% from the previous year but the increase in the allocation for central police in 2009-10 was 55% from the previous year

- The allocation for National Disease Control Programme declined from Rs. 1072 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 1063 crores in 2009-10 but the allocation for Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and Intelligence Bureau (IB) and Special Protection Group (SPG) increased from Rs. 872 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 1348 crores in 2009-10.
- Allocation for National T.B. Control Programme increased from Rs. 263 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 296 crores in 2009-10 (or an increase of around 12%). But the allocation for CBI increased from 167 crores in 2008-09 to Rs. 335 crores in year 2009-10 (or an increase of more than 100 %!). It may be noted here that every year more than 4 lakh Indian die due to T.B.
- Total allocation for Rashtrya Arogya Nidhi (or National Health Fund) in the Union Budget for 2009-10 was Rs. 38 crores. According to the Budget papers (Expenditure Budget, July 2009-10, Volume 2) Rashtrya Arogya Nidhi includes provision for financial assistance to the poor suffering from cancer. In a country where more than 4 lakh people die due to cancer; around 7 to 9 lakh new cases of cancer occur every year and 20 to 25 lakh cancer cases are there in India at any given point of time, allocation of Rs. 38 crores for poor who are suffering cancer is just not adequate.
- Allocation for Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Research (under Ministry of Science and Technology) was Rs. 100 crores in 2008- 09 Union Budget and it was reduced to Rs. 96 crores in the 2009-10 Union Budget. It may be noted here that big private drug companies spends thousands of crores of rupees on drug and pharmaceuticals research.
- One most important fact of India's central government public expenditure is that the percentage of central government expenditure allocated to Ministry of Defence in the 2009-10 union budget was more than 16% and for the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare it was only around 2.2% but globally the percentage of central government expenditure allocated to defence was 11% and to health it was 14%. This shows that the central government in India was most insensitive to the health needs of its people as compared to all other central governments in the world. This is despite the fact that India's share in world's disease and deaths is much higher and the people in India are more vulnerable to disease and deaths than the world average.

- The total allocation for Ministry of Health and Family Welfare in the Union Budget 2009-10 was Rs.22,641 crores only. This means 54 paisa per Indian per day! But even this amount is spent mainly on the salaries and allowances of government employees, maintenance of the Health Ministry and issuing advertisements worth crores of rupees to media basically to give publicity to certain individuals. This means the actual amount (non-salary non-advertisements) spent for promoting and protecting health of the citizens may be much less than 54 paisa per day.



No Huts Only Jets

FEDINA - No.154, Anjaneya Temple Street, Domlur, Bangalore - 560 071, IN
Tel : +91-80-2535 3190, 2535 3563 Email : fedinabl@gmail.com